

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 11, 16, 20-22, and 25-27 have been amended. Claims 4-6, 12-14, 17, and 18 have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 7-11 15, 16, and 19-27 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1-6, 10-18, 22, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,131,096 to Ng et al. ("Ng"). Claims 4-6, 12-14, 17, and 18 have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Claims 1, 11, and 22 recite, in part, that "the multiple groups of data from the multiple remote servers are merged into and displayed as one set of data." Claim 16 recites, in part, the feature of "merging the data from the first remote server and the data from the second remote server into a single data set." Claim 25 recites, in part, the feature of "merging the data from the first mobile terminal and the second mobile terminal into a single data set."

Ng teaches a local client that retrieves first PIM data from a global server and second PIM data from a second PIM PC. *See* Ng, Figure 1 and col. 4, line 54 - col. 5, line 3. The first PIM data and second PIM data are maintained separately. *See* Ng, Figure 1. The first PIM client knows the location of the first PIM data and the second PIM client knows the location of the second PIM data. *See* Ng, col. 5, lines 21-26. As such, the first PIM client may not access the second PIM data and the second PIM client may not access the first PIM data. As shown and described throughout Ng, the first and second PIM data are maintained separately. Furthermore, the first and second PIM data are accessed, synchronized, etc. separately. Ng does not teach or suggest merging the first and second PIM data in any way. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 11, 16, 22, and 25 distinguish over Ng and request that the §102 rejection of claims 1, 11, 16, 22, and 25 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 10, 15, 26, and 27 are either directly or indirectly dependent from one of claims 1, 11, and 25 and should distinguish over Ng for at least the same reasons as stated above. Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 2, 3, 10, 15, 26, and 27 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9, 19-21, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,236 to Pivowar ("Pivowar"). Claims 7-9, 19-21, 23, and 24 are either directly or indirectly dependent from one of claims 1, 16, and 22 and should distinguish over Ng for at least the same reasons as stated above. Pivowar does not remedy the deficiencies of Ng in that Pivowar also does not teach merging the data from the first remote server and the data from the second remote server into a single data set as recited in claims 1, 16, and 22. Instead, Pivowar teaches displaying multiple calendars simultaneously. *See* Pivowar, col. 5, lines 41-50. However, the calendars of each person are maintained separately and the data is not merged into a single calendar. *See* Pivowar, Figures 3C and 9B. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7-9, 19-21, 23, and 24 distinguish over the combination of Ng and Pivowar and request that the §103 rejection of claims 7-9, 19-21, 23, and 24 be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: _____

9/16/04

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Ashley M. Moore

Registration No.: 51,667

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant